

## **REMARKS**

The Specification has been amended. Claims 1 - 2, 5, 7, 9 - 10, 18, 20, 22, 24, and 26 have been amended to clarify the subject matter which Applicants regard as their invention. No new matter is introduced with these amendments, all of which are supported in the specification as originally filed. Claim 17 has been cancelled from the application without prejudice. Claims 1 - 5, 7, 9 - 12, 14 - 16, 18 - 20, 22 - 24, and 26 remain in the application.

### **I. Rejection under 35 U. S. C. §103(a)**

Paragraph 2 of the Office Action dated March 19, 2007 (hereinafter, “the Office Action”) states that Claims 1 - 5, 7, 9 - 12, 14 - 20, 22 - 24, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al. (U.S. 5,325,310) and further in view of Lee et al. (U. S. 6,212,553). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants have amended their independent claims herein to clarify the subject matter which Applicants regard as their invention, and respectfully submit that these claims are patentable over any combination of Johnson with Lee (assuming, *arguendo*, that such combination could be made and that one of skill in the art would be motivated to attempt it). With regard to independent Claim 1, for example, Applicants respectfully submit that neither reference, nor any combination thereof, teaches or suggests the limitations specified on lines 5 - 15. Independent Claims 18 and 22 specify analogous limitations. With regard to independent Claim 7, for example, Applicants respectfully submit that neither reference, nor any combination thereof, teaches or suggests the limitations specified on lines 11 - 18. Independent Claims 20 and

24 specify analogous limitations.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Johnson nor Lee, nor a combination thereof, teaches all limitations of Applicants' independent Claims 1, 7, 18, 20, 22, and 24. Accordingly, these independent claims are deemed patentable over the references. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that their dependent Claims 2 - 5, 9 - 12, 14 - 16, 19, 23, and 26 are deemed patentable by virtue of (*inter alia*) the patentability of the independent claims from which they depend.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the §103 rejection.

## II. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending rejected claims, withdrawal of all presently outstanding rejections, and allowance of all remaining claims at an early date.

Respectfully submitted,

/Marcia L. Doubet/ /#40,999/

Marcia L. Doubet  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 40,999

Customer Number for Correspondence: 43168

Phone: 407-343-7586

Fax: 407-343-7587